

**REMARKS**

With the cancellation of claims 7-10, claims 1-6 are now pending in the above-referenced application. Applicants note with appreciation the indication that claims 1 to 6 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding the objection to the drawings, Applicants have labeled Figures 1 to 3 as PRIOR ART. As for the contention of the Examiner that the drawings do not adequately show the limitation "the first earlier pore structure in the first section is oriented substantially perpendicularly to a main substrate plane," Applicants disagree that any amendment to the drawings is necessary to address this issue. Applicants submit that the drawings already show this feature; if the Examiner persists in this objection, Applicants request that the Examiner explain specifically why this feature is absent from the drawings. In the alternative, even if the drawings do not show this feature, Applicants submit that an illustration of the perpendicular orientation of the pores recited in the claims is not necessary for one of ordinary skill in the art to visualize, and therefore understand, this limitation of the claims. One of ordinary skill would have no difficulty, first of all, in visualizing pores, and mentally orienting the pores perpendicularly to a plane of a substrate.

As for the objection to the Title and Abstract, Applicants submit that the amendments made thereto have obviated this objection.

As for the objection to the specification, based on the absence of the words "first" and "second" before "earlier pore structure" in the specification, Applicants submit that no amendment is necessary. There is no requirement that every single word in a claim appear in the specification as well, which appears to be the basis for this objection. As long as the specification provides enough support, including support of the implicit kind, for a term in the claims, that is enough. The specification clearly supports the two pore structures; that is enough for Applicants to refer to them in the claims as first and second structures.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections and rejections be withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: 2/18/05

By By: Richard L. Mayer (B. No. 41,172)  
Richard L. Mayer  
(Reg. No. 22,490)

One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Attached hereto is a replacement sheet showing changes made to Figures 1 through 3, for which the approval of the Examiner is respectfully requested.